



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

|                      |                                     |                           |               |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Applicant</b>     | South Tahoe Public Utility District | <b>County</b>             | El Dorado     |
| <b>Project Title</b> | STPUD Well Destruction Project      | <b>Grant Request</b>      | \$ 149,406.89 |
|                      |                                     | <b>Total Project Cost</b> | \$ 157,506.83 |

**Project Description:** The Proposal develops plans and specifications for the well destruction program, including soliciting construction bids to retain a qualified C-57 Water Well Drilling Contractor, obtaining all required permits for the three proposed well destructions, and overseeing the proper destruction of the selected wells in accordance with California Well Standards.

### Evaluation Summary:

| Scoring Criterion                          | Score     |
|--|-----------|
| GWMP or Program                            | 3         |
| Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed | 5         |
| Work Plan                                  | 8         |
| Budget                                     | 5         |
| Schedule                                   | 3         |
| QA/QC                                      | 5         |
| Past Performance                           | 3         |
| Geographical Balance                       | 0         |
| <b>Total Score</b>                         | <b>32</b> |

- **GWMP or Program:** "The attached Groundwater Management Plan signature page is evidence that South Tahoe Public Utility District has an officially adopted Groundwater Management Plan." Applicant states that the plan was adopted on August 17, 2000, and meets CWC Section 10750 et al. Applicant has requested grant funding for a revision of the plan to include the components of SB 193 8 and AB 3030. However, the Groundwater Management Plan signature page is actually a resolution of intention to draft a GWMP, thus proof of adoption is lacking. In accordance with the PSP, scoring is based on: 1) applicant not providing evidence of an adopted GWMP; but 2) proposing to complete and adopt a GWMP (updated and SB 1938 compliant) within two years.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion for the project description is fully addressed and well documented. The project description is presented clearly so that the read has a complete understanding of the project. A complete, detailed description was provided for each well to be abandoned. The application demonstrates collaboration with other agencies, a long term need, and is consistent with the goals and objectives of their GWMP.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion for the work plan is addressed, but is not thoroughly documented. The work plan is detailed and is consistent with the budget and schedule. A strategy for progress and performance is presented; however; work described in the project description didn't translate over to the work plan, such as the outreach efforts.
- **Budget:** The criterion for the budget is fully addressed and well documented. The budget narrative provides the assumptions and detail for the derived costs presented in the table..
- **Schedule:** The criterion for the schedule is less than fully addressed and is not thoroughly documented. The schedule almost follows the work plan and budget, but lacks Task 1. The time frames seem reasonable and deliverables are identified. The lack of a schedule narrative prevents the applicant from providing a basis for the schedule, indicate the readiness to proceed once funding is available, and how any obstacles will be overcome.



## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **QA/QC:** The criterion for QA/QC is fully addressed and well documented. Standard methodologies for well destructions will be utilized, experienced staff members will oversee the project, a licensed driller will be hired, and onsite inspections will take place.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion for past performance is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Applicant does not expand on its performance for the projects list provided to include whether projects were within budget, on schedule, or the interaction between the grantee and grant administrator. The applicant has received many grants for various projects in the past five years.